

Paul Coverdell can no longer be with us in body. But the wisdom, generosity, civility, patriotism, and dedication that he brought to this Congress will never die.

We honor his memory today through enactment of this important legislation.

But I say we should continue to honor his life's work by seeing his missions through—from giving our children a choice in education, to restoring the health care of the defenders of America.

Mr. Speaker, let us pay tribute to a great leader, by not only passing this bill today, but also redoubling our efforts to see all the reforms of Senator Paul Coverdell enacted into law.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 360, which honors the memory of our esteemed colleague, Paul Coverdell.

As a respected Member of the U.S. Senate and leader of the Peace Corps, Paul Coverdell's devotion to public service knew no partisan bounds. It is fitting that we consider a measure honoring him.

But rather than having buildings named after him, I believe a more fitting tribute would be to finish the work he helped start, to restore health care to America's military retirees.

Paul Coverdell was one of the four original sponsors of The Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act. Along with Senator TIM JOHNSON, Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD and myself, Senator Coverdell introduced the bill that is largely credited with giving rise to Tricare for Life.

TFL will go a long way to restoring earned health care to many elderly military retirees, but we need to keep our promise to all military retirees.

TFL does not help military retirees who don't qualify for Medicare and don't have access to quality care at military bases. We need to keep our promise to them.

And retirees who entered the service prior to 1956 actually had health care benefits taken away from them. We need to keep our promise to them, too. That is what Paul Coverdell wanted and that is what we should do.

Paul Coverdell would prefer a legacy of helping restore health care to people who need it, who earned it and were promised it.

We should honor the memory of our late colleague by passing the Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in respectful opposition to S. 360. Let me make it clear that my opposition to this measure is in no way, shape or form a reflection on Senator Paul Coverdell or his memory. Paul Coverdell was an able Senator and dedicated public servant. He deserves to be honored by the Congress of the United States; indeed, we did so last year when we passed the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act. This was a fitting tribute as Senator Coverdell made the improvement of forensic science services one of his highest priorities.

The Congress frequently names buildings, post offices and bridges after individuals. The Peace Corps is different. This organization is the work of thousands of dedicated men and women who volunteer to serve in the most remote corners of our planet. The Peace Corps is the sum of their efforts, not the work of any individual.

I received a letter on this subject from one of my constituents who was himself a Peace Corps volunteer. He writes, "As a former

Peace Corps Volunteer, I am requesting that S. 360 not be brought to the House floor as a non-controversial bill. I, along with what I suspect is a majority of former volunteers, am against the idea of naming the Peace Corps Headquarters after the late Senator Coverdell. I have nothing against the late Senator. It's my understanding that he was a good man who did his best as a Senator and a Peace Corps Director. However, the Peace Corps building should not be named after any one single person"

In the memory of the thousands of men and women, including Paul Coverdell, who have served the Peace Corps, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today we honor Senator Paul D. Coverdell for a lifetime of service to the people of Georgia and this country. S. 360 dedicates the U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers Headquarters, the World Wise Schools Programs, and a yet to be constructed building at the University of Georgia, to this outstanding public servant. Paul Coverdell was an honorable man and this is the least we can do for someone who gave so much of his life to serving the community and the nation.

Known for his unflinching work ethic, the Senator was not one to let grass grow under his feet. A veteran of the U.S. Army and the Peace Corps, Senator Coverdell was elected to Georgia State Senate in 1970 where he served as minority leader for 15 years. He was then appointed director of the U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers in 1989, a position from which he initiated the World Wise Schools Programs, pairing students with Corps volunteers, to give them a personal experience serving the world's less fortunate. It is only fitting we rename the Peace Corps Volunteers Headquarters Building and the World Wise Schools Programs, in his honor.

Deeply concerned with education policy, Senator Coverdell chaired the Senate Republican Task Force on Education, in addition to drafting legislation to create Education Savings Accounts. He was also a strong proponent of drug policy reform—he defended the decision to continue U.S. support for the fight of the Colombian drug trade; and he authored the 1999 Foreign Kingpin Designation Act.

I am proud to have served with my fellow Georgian, Senator Paul D. Coverdell. Though we can never replace him, he will not be forgotten. On this day, I ask my colleagues to remember him as a man of principle and conviction, and offer S. 360 as a small token of our appreciation for his life and legacy.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 360.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1045

REPORT ON H.R. 2506, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002

Mr. KOLBE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-142) on the bill (H.R. 2506) making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, and for sundry independent agencies and corporations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved.

MAKING IN ORDER ON JULY 18, 2001, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 50, AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on July 18, 2001, or any day thereafter, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 50) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the People's Republic of China;

That the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment;

That all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived;

That the joint resolution be debatable for 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (in opposition to the joint resolution) and a Member in support of the joint resolution;

That pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion; and

That the provisions of section 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the People's Republic of China for the remainder of the first session of the 107th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 36, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 189

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered by Representative Conyers of Michigan or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 189 is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of a constitutional amendment which would authorize Congress to ban the physical desecration of the American flag.

H. Res. 189 provides for 2 hours of debate in the House of Representatives, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Upon the adoption of this rule, H.J. Res. 36 is made in order and considered as read. The rule also makes in order a substitute amendment if offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for 1 hour, equally divided between a proponent and an opponent. All points of order are waived against this amendment.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, this rule would allow Congress to debate legislation that protects our American heritage by protecting one of our most important symbols, our flag. Most Americans look to the flag as a symbol of our unity, our sovereignty and our democracy. Throughout the years, millions of

Americans have fought and died for this country, and they look to the flag as the embodiment of our country's values.

Two reasons for supporting this measure come to mind as we consider this legislation: first, from a logical standpoint, if we prohibit the destruction of U.S. currency by law, then surely protecting our symbol of freedom and democracy is just as important.

The second reason is a more powerful one. Many Members believe it is the duty of Congress to protect the integrity of our heritage from individuals who disrespect this country.

It is in the best interests of the American people to pass this legislation, and I wholeheartedly support it. In fact, I am an original cosponsor of H.J. Res. 36.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. It is a pleasure to serve on the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 36. I firmly believe that passing this constitutional amendment would abandon the very values and principles upon which this country was founded.

Make no mistake, I deplore the desecration of the flag. The flag is a symbol of our country and a reminder of our great heritage. I find it unfortunate and repugnant that a few individuals choose to desecrate that which we hold so dear. However, it is because of my love for the flag and the country for which it stands that, unfortunately, I have no choice but to oppose this well-intentioned yet misguided, in my view, legislation.

Our country was founded on certain principles. Chief among these principles is freedom of speech and expression. These freedoms were included in the Bill of Rights because the Founding Fathers took deliberate steps to avoid creating a country in which individuals' civil liberties could be abridged by the Government. Yet that is exactly what this amendment would do. It begins a dangerous trend in which the Government can decide which ideas are legal and which must be suppressed.

Ultimately, we must remember that it is not simply the flag we honor but, rather, the principles it embodies. To restrict people's means of expression would do nothing but abandon those principles, and to destroy these principles would be a far greater travesty than to destroy its symbol. Indeed, it would render the symbol meaningless.

Earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, I was with a group of 15 Members of Congress who were visiting the American cemetery in Normandy, France. There we saw the graves of more than 9,000 men and women who gave their lives

not just for the liberation of Europe but in defense of an idea: democracy, and all that it stands for. What democracy stands for is forever enshrined in our Constitution. These men and women who died for an idea, and the patriots who came before and after them, understand that idea.

I brought back these two flags, this one especially, the American flag. The other is the flag of France. I hold it here to remind myself of what others gave so that I may be here today in this country which protects individual rights and liberties more than any other country in the world. Understand, though, this flag itself has little inherent value. It is cloth attached to a piece of wood. The value of this cloth is in the messages that it conveys and the country that it stands for and the people who have fought and died to keep this flag and others like it flying high and free. Those men who died storming Omaha and Utah Beaches did not fight for a flag; they fought for the idea that our flag represents. This amendment, in my view, would diminish what those brave men and women fought and died for.

The last time Congress debated a similar bill, retired four-star general and current Secretary of State Colin Powell said that he would not support amending the Constitution to protect the flag. In fact, General Powell said, "I would not amend that great shield of democracy to hammer a few miscreants. The flag will be flying proudly long after they have slunk away."

We are too secure as a Nation to risk our commitment to freedom by endeavoring to legislate patriotism. If we tamper with our Constitution because of the antics of a handful of thoughtless and obnoxious people, we will have reduced the flag as a symbol of freedom, not enhanced it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule. The American flag serves a unique role as the symbol of the ideals upon which America was founded. It is a national asset that helps to preserve our unity, our freedom, and our liberty as Americans. This symbol represents our country's many hard-won freedoms paid for with the lives of thousands and thousands of young men and women over this Nation's history. For years, 48 States and the District of Columbia enforced laws prohibiting the physical desecration of the American flag. In the 1989 Texas v. Johnson ruling, the United States Supreme Court in a 5-4 vote overthrew what until then had been settled law and ruled that flag desecration as a means of public protest is an act of free expression protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. A year later, essentially reiterating its Johnson ruling,